



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/875,547

06/05/2001

Dan Kikinis

007287.00008

6896

22907 7590 04/09/2010

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13th STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1200

WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER

SALTARELLI, DOMINIC D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2421

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/09/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/875,547	Applicant(s) KIKINIS, DAN	
	Examiner DOMINIC D. SALTARELLI	Art Unit 2421	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,11-15 and 18-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,11-15 and 18-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed January 25, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant maintains the argument that because Hassell does not explicitly disclose automatically defaulting to the first storage device if the second storage device is checked and found to be unavailable, and therefore cannot be said to anticipate the claim limitations directed to such (applicant's remarks, pages 8-9).

In response, the examiner agrees that Hassell lacks an explicit disclosure that unambiguously teaches the claimed limitations, it remains the examiner's understanding of Hassell that upon actual implementation of the disclosed system, the claimed features of determining whether a second storage device, separate from the content rendering system is available upon received a record command, and defaulting to a first storage device if the second is determined to be unavailable.

In regard to the claim, several features must be present and operate in a certain order for the claim limitations to be realized.

- i. there must be two separate storage devices
- ii. there must be an expressly articulated preference for the external storage device

- iii. there must be a preliminary check for available storage space prior to actually storing content
- iv. if there is room, recording must actually take place

Regarding (i), Hassell discloses that there are plural storage devices available (paragraph 0009), both external using removable media (paragraph 0019), and also an internal digital storage device (paragraph 0021), located inside the set top device. So it is clear in Hassell that at least two storage devices are disclosed (secondary storage device 32, paragraph 0019, and digital storage device 31, paragraph 0020, where at least one of the devices is external to the set top, the other internal, see fig. 2).

Regarding (ii), Hassell articulates a clear preference for utilizing external, removable media for recording programs (in each case, Hassell lists using the external secondary storage first, prior to stating that a user can *also* record programs to the digital storage device, paragraphs 0019-0020), and places emphasis on primarily using removable storage media to create distinct volumes of recorded content (paragraphs 0081, 0089, and 0090).

Regarding (iii), Hassell discloses the step of ascertaining available storage space prior to actual program recording taking place (paragraph 0043). What is significant to note here is that before any particular volume can be examined for available storage space, it must first be ascertained that said volume is even present, which Hassell also discloses (paragraph 0089).

Regarding (iv), Hassell discloses that an automated, best fit algorithm is used to ensure the program is recorded if all possible (paragraph 0051).

Given each of these disclosed elements in order: (i) there are plural storage devices; (ii) there is a clear preference for creating volumes on external, removable media rather than the internal digital storage; and (iii) there is an explicit disclosure of searching for available storage space that is not limited to an assumed presence of a single, loaded volume; once the disclosed algorithm is implemented (which is further disclosed of even being capable of storing programming in discontinuous locations in storage) the identified program is recorded somewhere, the system does not simply freeze up if it is determined that a preferred external DVD drive happens to not have a disc loaded into it

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4-8, 11-15, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassell et al. (US 2004/0128685 A1, of record) [Hassell] in view of Shintani (5,668,591, of record) and Lee et al. (5,937,163, of record) [Lee].

Regarding claims 1, 8, and 15, Hassell discloses a method (and corresponding system) comprising:

receiving, by a content rendering system, a command to record a program (paragraph 0050);

determining whether a second storage device is available, wherein the second storage device is separate from the content rendering system (the system checks for storage space prior to recording paragraph 0051 where before recording to a volume on removable storage can take place, it must first be verified that a removable volume is even present, where Hassell teaches that accessing features of the program guide includes a first check regarding available volumes paragraph 0089);

in response to determining that the second storage device is unavailable, automatically recording the program to a first storage device (the system has an automated algorithm for finding storage space, paragraph 0051, and in the event that it is determined a removable volume is unavailable, Hassell discloses that storage may also take place on the digital storage device, paragraph 0052);

displaying an electronic programming guide comprising a listing of one or more programs (figs. 5a-b), including the recorded program (paragraph 0081-0082);

receiving, by the content rendering system, input corresponding to an actuation of a command selecting the recorded program from the listing of one or more programs and automatically transferring the recorded program from the first storage device in the content rendering system to the second storage device (see the last sentence of paragraph 9) in response to the actuation (paragraphs

19-21, and 81, wherein actuation of the “transfer” key causes the system to transfer a selected program to another volume, where the first and second storage devices [volumes] consist of removable discs, see paragraph 89).

.Hassell fails to disclose the actuation includes a single pressing of a selected portion of a web phone.

In an analogous art, Shintani teaches using a personal digital assistant to transmit commands to a set top box (cable box 1), where using such a type of intelligent remote control unit also allows a user to engage in more interactive functions (col. 3, lines 16-36).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method, computer readable medium, and system disclosed by Hassell to use a personal digital assistant as the associated remote control [would thus include the disclosed “transfer” key as found on the remote control disclosed by Hassell], as taught by Shintani, providing the benefit of allowing a user to engage in more interactive functions, like games, home shopping, banking, and the like.

Hassell and Shintani fail to disclose the personal digital assistant is a web phone.

In an analogous art, Lee teaches it was known at the time to enable personal digital assistants with ‘web phone’ capabilities (accessing the World Wide Web over a cellular network, see col. 4, lines 6-34, the ‘Webman’ product).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method, computer readable medium, and system disclosed by Hassell and Shintani to enable the personal digital assistant as a web phone, as taught by Lee, simply utilizing a brand of PDA which was both known and commercially available at the time.

Regarding claims 4, 11, and 18, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method, machine readable medium, and system of claims 1, 8, and 15, wherein in response to a second input corresponding to a second actuation of a second command, transferring the program from the second storage device to the first storage device of the content rendering system, wherein the second actuation corresponds to a pressing of a second portion of the personal digital assistant (a user is provided with the means to transfer programs between volumes at will using the "transfer" key, see paragraphs 9 and 81).

Regarding claims 5, 12, and 19, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method, machine readable medium, and system of claims 4, 11, and 18, and further discloses maintaining an index of programs and related auxiliary data transferred from the first storage device to the second storage device (paragraphs 85-86).

Regarding claims 6, 13, and 20, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method, machine readable medium, and system of claims 5, 12, and 19, wherein the second storage device is a removable storage device (Hassell, paragraph 85), and in response to a user selecting the program, the content rendering system prompts for the insertion of the removable storage device into the content rendering system (Hassell, paragraph 89).

Regarding claims 7, 14, and 21, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method, machine readable medium, and system of claims 6, 14, and 20, wherein the removable storage device is a DVD-RAM (paragraph 20).

Regarding claim 22, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method of claim 4, wherein the second actuation corresponds to a single pressing of a transfer function button on the remote control (the personal digital assistant is the remote control, see Shintani, col. 3, lines 16-36).

Regarding claim 23, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method of claim 4, wherein the first portion and the second portion are the same portion (the 'transfer' key is the common portion used in transferring programs from one location to another, see Hassell, paragraph 81).

Regarding claim 24, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the apparatus of claim 15, wherein Hassell discloses the content rendering system to include a tuner (to perform the channel tuning operation, paragraph 19); a signal input (fig. 2, input 26); a storage medium (fig. 2, digital storage device 31); a processor (an inherent feature of the disclosed STB, which is necessary to control the operations ascribed to the STB); a digital video encoder and decoder (the encoder for converting the program to a desired format, see paragraph 82, where the destination for storage is a digital medium, see paragraph 85, and the decoder for outputting program content to a television, see paragraph 22); and a digital output port (for outputting digital signals on a digital bus, see paragraph 19).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2421

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOMINIC D. SALTARELLI whose telephone number is (571)272-7302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dominic D Saltarelli/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2421